

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

## 1. APPOINTMENT DETAIL

Compare the requisition #, appointment type, classification and appointment data in the audit tool with the competition file information (posting, offer letter) and ensure the correct appointment is being audited before proceeding.

Appointment Audited:

Name:	<input type="text"/>	Effective Date:	<input type="text"/>
Appointment Type:	<input type="text"/>	Department:	<input type="text"/>
Classification:	<input type="text"/>	Organization:	<input type="text"/>
Job Title:	<input type="text"/>	City:	<input type="text"/>

The appointment was:  An initial appointment resulting from above competition  
 An appointment off the eligibility list from above competition  
 No competition (appointed directly by ministry)  
 Other (specify)

This was an audit of the process used to create an inventory or a batched process. List appts and requisitions:

## 2. RECRUITMENT APPROACH

Review the recruitment approach and materials (e.g. requisition, posting, job information, etc.)

a) Was the process a:  standard competition (including EOI's)  other, please describe:   
 provincial recruitment process (many positions in various locations)   
 batched or continuous intake/ongoing recruitment process  
 competition limited to an inventory (pool or list) --> inventory requisition #:

b) Was the position:  Excluded  BCGEU  PEA  Dual  Other, please describe:

c) Was some form of notice (posting, EOI email, website ad, etc) regarding the opportunity provided to applicants?  Yes  No  UTD

What evidence supports this finding?

If no, how were potential applicants identified?

d) Was the opportunity:  Internal  External  UTD

e) Were there any more restrictions to the applicant pool?  Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

f) Duration of posting, if known:

g) Did the notice indicate that an eligibility list may be established?  Yes  No

### Audit Report

Check off and complete the following common statements that are applicable or summarize the recruitment approach in the free text box provided.

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

The  [ internal, external ]  [ notice, posting, expression of interest ] for a  [ job title ] attracted  [number from 3a] applicants.

The internal  [ notice, posting, expression of interest ] for a  [ job title ] was restricted to  [ geographic location, organization, work unit, etc. ]

The external  [ notice, posting, expression of interest ] for a  [ job title ] was restricted to  [ geographic location, employment equity group, etc. ]

h) Did the notice (including additional information via electronic links or subsequently given) provide applicants with sufficient detailed and relevant information reflecting both the job and the selection criteria?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details.

i) Was there consistency, relevancy, reasonableness between the duties described in the job description, the notice and the stated selection criteria?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details.

j) Was the opportunity available to a reasonable applicant pool?  Yes  No  UTD

If no, provide details.

### Audit Report

Summarize any recruitment errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.

## 3. SCREENING AND SHORT-LISTING

Review the screening and short-listing process and materials (e.g. summary of applicants, resumes, questionnaire report, related spreadsheets, etc.)

a) How many applicants applied?

b) How many applicants were screened in (considered to meet eligibility and restrictions requirements)?

c) How many candidates were short-listed for further considerations?

d) How many applicants withdrew during the screening/short-listing stage?

Comments:

e) What were applicants required to provide in order to apply for this position? Check all that apply.

- cover letter     self-assessment questionnaire     other, please describe:  
 resume     qualifications grid

### Audit Report

## Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

**Check off and complete the following common statements that are applicable or summarize the screening/short-listing stage in the free text box provided.**

- This opportunity attracted [ number from 3a ] applicants, [ 3a - 3b ] of whom were deemed ineligible and not considered further.
- Based on a review of applicant  the panel short-listed [ number from 3c ] candidates.
- The panel reviewed applicants' related education and experience and short-listed [number from 3c] candidates.
- [number from 3d] applicants/candidates withdrew during this stage of the process.
- 

f) Did evidence indicate that all applications submitted for this competition were accounted for?  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
(Reconcile SOA and Questionnaire report or short-listing info).

What evidence supports this finding?

g) Were all late applications treated reasonably and consistently?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

h) Were applicants screened consistently against mandatory eligibility requirements? (e.g. legally entitled to work in Canada, two year lateral transfer rule, submission of a questionnaire, etc.)  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

i) If this was a restricted competition (e.g. in service, ministry, branch, location, etc), were the restrictions applied consistently?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

j) Was there a short-listing process to assess minimum qualifications (education, experience, designations, certification, etc.)?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

Briefly describe.

k) If there was a short-listing process, was the approach (e.g. self-assessment questionnaire, point-rated) and criteria established objective, relevant and reasonable?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no (e.g. poor question design/structure, evaluation of qualitative aspects like KSA's, use of unrelated or unstated criteria, etc.), provide details.

l) Were all of the mandatory or preferred qualifications used stated in either the posting or job profile?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details (e.g. equivalencies were considered but not stated or a new qualification introduced).

## Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

m) Were the mandatory requirements used in short-listing less than those advertised?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If yes, provide details.

n) Were the mandatory education or experience requirements used in short-listing greater or at a higher level than those advertised?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If yes, provide details.

o) Given the criteria that was used to short-list, was it applied consistently across applicants?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details.

p) Did all candidates who met the mandatory qualifying criteria (e.g. education and experience) proceed to the next phase of the selection process?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details (i.e. qualified candidates not advanced):

q) Select a representative sample (5 - 10%) of those short-listed. (Not less than three candidates. For large competitions (>200 applicants) select a maximum of 20 candidates). Were they appropriately short-listed?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

Provide names and details.

r) Select a representative sample (5 - 10%) of those not short-listed. (Not less than three candidates. For large competitions (>200 applicants) select a maximum of 20 applicants). Were they appropriately eliminated?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

Provide names and details.

### Audit Report

Summarize any screening or short-listing errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.

## 4. INTERVIEWING AND TESTING

Review the assessment process and materials (e.g. selection criteria, testing and interview questions, associated marking criteria, panel notes, rating guides, etc.)

a) Was there a panel established? (more than one person)  Yes  No  UTD

If no, why?

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

b) What assessment/testing methods were used? Check off all that apply:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with no BI questions  | <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with only BI questions                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Fitness Test (COPAT, SOPAT etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interview mix including BI questions (may include oral communication skills)    | <input type="checkbox"/> Suitability interview                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <input type="text"/>      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Written exam or assignment (knowledge and skills)                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral presentation (within interview or independent of) | <input type="checkbox"/> None                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Standardized Test (e.g. aptitude, EQ, online Pre-Valuation, REACT, typing test) | <input type="checkbox"/> Role Play (within interview or independent of)         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Practical work simulation (field exercise, in-basket exercise)                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Work Sample  |  |

c) If this is a competition from an established inventory, what assessments were done in the creation of the inventory?

### Audit Report

Check off and complete the following common statements that are applicable or summarize the assessment stage in the free text box provided.

- [ Number ] candidates were assessed through an interview which [ number ] passed.
- [ Number ] candidates were assessed by a [ testing type ] which [ number ] passed.
- [ Number ] candidates were initially assessed by a [ testing type ] which [ number ] passed. These candidates were advanced to an interview which [ number ] passed.
- [ Number ] candidates were initially assessed through an interview which [ number ] passed. These candidates were advanced to an interview which [ number ] passed.
- [ Number ] candidates were assessed through a combined [ testing type ] and interview, from which [ number ] advanced.
- [ Number ] candidates withdrew during this stage of the process.
- 

d) Were the assessed selection criteria consistent with the stated criteria in posting or job profile?  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
If no, were the criteria relevant and reasonable?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

Provide details:

e) Was there marking criteria (e.g. ideal answers, response elements, behavioural indicators, etc.) established that provided a sufficient means of assessing responses for each assessment method used (for each question asked)?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

## Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

**Competition No:**

- f) Was the interview and testing approach (e.g. type of assessment, information/time given to candidates to prepare) fair, consistent and relevant?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details.

- g) Were minimum qualifying standards (e.g. pass marks if using numerical ratings) established and applied for each assessment method used?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

If no, not evident, or changes made to an established standard, provide details:

- h) Review the file documentation for, at a minimum: (1) the audited candidate(s); (2) if applicable, another appointed candidate; (3) if applicable, the first and last candidates placed on the eligibility list; (4) the highest-rated unsuccessful candidate; and (5) an unsuccessful candidate with a mid-range score, and answer the following questions.**

- i) Were candidates assessed and evaluated consistently, using the same standards?  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
e.g. comparison of panel notes to scoring to marking key and comparison of scoring between candidates.

What evidence supports this finding? (List the names of reviewed candidates).

If no, what was the difference, and was it different enough that a candidate is measurably disadvantaged relative to other candidates?

- ii) Were all assessment scores/marks accounted for? e.g. accurate transcriptions of individual scores to final rating sheet, accurate calculations (e.g. tabulation, weighting, rounding, etc.).  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, give details of discrepancies.

### Audit Report

**Summarize any interviewing or testing errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.**

## 5. PAST WORK PERFORMANCE

**Review the past work performance process and materials (e.g. referees, references, performance appraisals, etc.)**

- a) Was past work performance assessed?  Yes  No  UTD

What evidence supports this finding?

- b) If it was assessed, how many candidates was it assessed for?

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

c) How was past work performance rated?

- Panel or hiring manager determined pass/fail       Areas of performance were rated using a qualitative scale (e.g. poor to excellent)
- Areas of performance were point-scored using a quantitative scale (e.g. 1-5 points)       Other

d) If rated on a quantitative or qualitative scale, who assigned the rating?

- Hiring manager or panel member     Referee (supervisor, manager, colleague, etc)     UTD     NA

e) If referees assigned ratings, how were these used?

- Panel used the information as a basis for determining an overall pass or fail     NA
- Point-scores were added to candidates' overall competition score     Other (specify)
- Referee ratings determined if candidates passed or failed

f) Did all candidates who were assessed on this factor pass?

- Yes     No

If no, give details (e.g. how many failed, on what basis).

### Audit Report

Check off and complete the following common statements that are applicable or summarize the past work performance stage in the free text box provided.

- A  [ pass/fail or point-scored ] assessment of past work performance was conducted for the  [ highest scoring/only qualified ] candidate, which the candidate  [ passed/failed ]
- A  [ pass/fail or point-scored ] assessment of past work performance was conducted for  [ # of the highest scoring/qualified ] candidates, all of whom passed.
- A  [ pass/fail or point-scored ] assessment of past work performance was conducted for  [ # of the highest scoring/qualified ] candidates, which  [ number ] passed.
- The points were added to candidate overall competition score.
- [ Number ] candidates withdrew during this stage of the process.
- 

g) Was past work performance assessed reasonably and consistently according to criteria relevant to the job?

- Yes     No     UTD

What evidence supports this finding?

h) Were past work performance checks completed for all candidates who were offered a position or placed on an eligibility list?

- Yes     No     UTD

If no, give details:

## Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

**Competition No:**

- i) Did past work performance checks include at least one reference from applicant's supervisor or equivalent, as per policy?  Yes  No  UTD

If no, or supervisor "equivalent" used, provide details:

- j) If past work performance was not documented, was the candidate's supervisor or equivalent on the hiring panel?  Yes - Current Supervisor  
 Yes - Previous Supervisor  
 No  NA

- k) Based on the available evidence, were all contacted referees authorized by the candidates?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details:

### Audit Report

**Summarize any past work performance errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.**

## 6. YEARS OF CONTINUOUS SERVICE

Complete for BCGEU and PEA positions only:

- a) Were years of continuous service considered?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

- b) Were years of continuous service correctly assessed using the applicable calculation? (Yes responses may include "mental gymnastics" where there is a large point-spread between candidates. NA responses may include cases where all candidates are out of service.)  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details (e.g. what was the error and did the application or omission affect the ranking of candidates).

Complete for positions other than BCGEU and PEA:

- c) Based on available evidence, were years of continuous service considered?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

- d) If years of continuous service were assessed, was the assessment reasonable, consistent and accurate?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

If no, provide details.

### Audit Report

**Summarize any years of continuous service errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.**

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

## 7. RESULTS

Review the final ratings and notification details for those candidates who qualified (met all the assessment standards).

- a) Were initial (i.e. immediate) appointments made?  Yes  No
- b) If yes, how many were made?  Names:
- c) Was an eligibility list established?  Yes  No
- d) If yes, how many candidates were placed on it?  Names:   
Term of list:
- e)  Other result Please describe:

### Audit Report

Check off and complete the following common statements that are applicable or summarize the past work performance stage in the free text box provided.

- Following  [ consideration/an assessment ] of years of continuous service, the highest-ranked candidate  [ Auditee name ] was appointed to the position.
- Following  [ consideration/an assessment ] of years of continuous service, the  [ number ] highest-ranking candidates  [ , including auditee name, ] were appointed to the position.
- The highest-ranked candidate  [ , auditee name, ] was appointed to the position.
- The  [ number ] highest-ranking candidates  [ , including auditee name, ] were appointed to the position.
- An eligibility list was established and  [ number ] candidates were placed on it in rank order.
- [ Auditee name ], who was  [ first,second,third... ] on eligibility list was subsequently appointed.
- 

- f) Candidate(s) were made an offer or, if applicable, placed on eligibility list in correct order.  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
If no, provide details.
- g) Where a candidate declined the offer, were subsequent offer(s) made in order of eligibility?  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
If no, provide details.
- h) Are the appointment decisions a reasonable outcome of the assessment process?  Yes  No  UTD  NA  
If no, provide details.

### Audit Report

Summarize any result errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

## 8. NOTIFICATION

Review the documentation related to the communication of the appointment decision to the unsuccessful applicants.

a) Did all unsuccessful **employee** applicants receive communication that they were unsuccessful at the conclusion of the staffing process (including ineligible employee applicants)?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

Briefly describe. (# of regrets, # of EL, withdrawals, etc.)

b) Disclosure (transparency):

- i) Notification to external candidates?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- ii) Disclosure of multiple initial appointments?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- iii) If bargaining unit, name of successful employee provided?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- iv) If bargaining unit, classfn. of successful employee provided?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- v) Offer of feedback to employees?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- vi) Candidates on eligibility list advised?  Yes  No  UTD  NA
- vii) Candidates not on eligibility list advised one was established?  Yes  No  UTD  NA

What evidence supports this finding?

### Audit Report

Summarize any notification errors or notes for improvement that were identified, and their impact on the outcome.

## 9. STANDARDS OF CONDUCT/CONFLICT OF INTEREST

a) Actions taken by employees during the staffing process must be aligned with the Public Service Standards of Conduct policy. Did evidence indicate a conflict of interest?  Yes  No

If yes, provide details.

## 10. PROCESS CONCLUSIONS

a) Is there enough evidence to make a conclusion concerning a merit process?  Yes  No

If not, what evidence is missing?

b) If yes, what is the process finding?  Merit  Merit Not Applied

Merit with Exception

What evidence/assumption(s) support this conclusion?

## Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

**Competition No:**

i) If errors were identified with negative impact on the outcome, indicate the category in which they occurred:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approach                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Past Work Performance       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Short-listing            | <input type="checkbox"/> Years of Continuous Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interviewing and testing |  |

ii) If errors were identified that were mitigated or had an unknown impact on the outcome, indicate the categories in which they occurred:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approach                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Past Work Performance       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Short-listing            | <input type="checkbox"/> Years of Continuous Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interviewing and testing | <input type="checkbox"/> Notification                |

### 11. APPOINTEE CONCLUSIONS

*The following questions are answered for each appointment being audited against this competition.*

**Name:**

a) Is there enough evidence to indicate that the individual, when appointed, possessed the required qualifications for the position?  Yes  No  UTD

If no, what evidence is missing?

b) What is the Appointee finding?  Qualified  Qualifications not Demonstrated  Not Qualified

c) Based on the documentation at hand, had the candidate previously acted in the same position?  Yes - Auxiliary  Yes - TA  
 No  UTD

### 12. DOCUMENTATION

**Consider the state (quality and quantity) of documentation and evidence provided for this competition.**

a) Documentation at Each State of Assessment:

	Complete at Receipt	Incomplete at Receipt Documents Provided During Audit	Incomplete at Receipt Conclusion - Documents Not Provided	NA
Screening and Short-Listing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interviewing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Testing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Past Work Performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Years of Continuous Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Notification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other <input style="width: 150px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Describe extent of missing documentation (e.g. one set of panel notes vs. all panel notes):

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

- |                                    |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Amount of follow-up required:   | <b>BCPSA</b>             | <b>Ministry/Org.</b>     |
| <b>None (0)</b>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Minimal (1-2 times)</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Some (3-4 times)</b>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Extensive (5 or more times)</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

d) Follow-up was required for:

- missing documents                       verbal evidence in lieu of documentation (e.g. no recorded short-listing, marking criteria, pwp, etc.) Note: automatically results in insufficient documentation.
- clarification or explanation of process

Notes:

e) Was the documentation of this process:

- Good** - The hiring process was comprehensively documented with minimal or no follow-up required.
- Sufficient** - The hiring process was partially documented. Some documents were missing or incomplete and/or some aspects of the process required clarification. There was sufficient information provided to conduct the audit.
- Insufficient** - The hiring process was insufficiently documented. Key aspects of the process were not documented and a detailed explanation was required from the ministry representative to complete the audit.

### Audit Report

**Check off and complete the following competition specific audit statements that summarize the state of documentation in the free box provided.**

Good Documentation:

- This competition was well documented which enabled the auditor to conduct a full audit.
- This competition was well documented and, with minimal clarification provided by the hiring manager, the auditor was able to conduct a full audit.
- This competition was well documented. While  was/were missing, it was/they were ] not essential to complete a full audit. **Note: for this finding, documentation missing would be discrete pieces of the file such as one set of panel notes, one reference out of several.**

Sufficient Documentation:

- The documentation of this competition was sufficient. Aspects of  [ e.g. short-listing, pwp, notifications ] were unclear or missing which required the auditor to seek additional documentation and/or clarification in order to conduct the audit.
- The documentation of this competition was sufficient. While  [ e.g. short-listing, pwp, notifications ] missing, the auditor was able to conduct the audit based on the available information.
- The documentation of this competition was sufficient. There was a discrepancy with respect to  [ resumes/panel notes/short-listing spreadsheet remained incomplete/missing. Based on the hiring manager/ministry representative's ] Based on additional information provided by the hiring manager, the auditor determined that the discrepancy was an error in documentation.

# Annual Audit Tool - Merit Performance

Competition No:

Insufficient Documentation:

The documentation of this competition was insufficient. While most of the process was well documented, there was no or incomplete [ e.g. marking criteria for an interview question. Based on the hiring manager/ministry representative's explanation of e.g. how the panel marked the responses, ]  
the auditor concluded that this aspect was fairly assessed but insufficiently documented.

The documentation of this competition was insufficient. Specifically, [ short-listing/pwp/notifications/etc was incomplete/missing/undocumented. Based on the hiring manager/ministry representative's ]  
explanation of what occurred, the auditor concluded these stages were fairly assessed but insufficiently documented.

The documentation of this competition was insufficient. While some of the missing documentation was subsequently provided, [ resumes/panel notes/short-listing spreadsheet remained incomplete/missing. Based on the hiring manager/ministry representative's ]  
explanation of what occurred, the auditor concluded these aspects were fairly assessed but insufficiently documented.

This was a poorly documented competition. Based on the information provided, the auditor was unable to determine whether the recruitment and selection process was properly applied to result in an appointment based on merit.

### 13. AUDITOR SIGN-OFF

Other comments (e.g. good/poor staffing practices, etc.)

***I certify this audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted audit standards utilizing audit methodology reviewed and supported by the Ministry of Finance, Internal Audit and Advisory Services.***

Signed off by:

Date:

### 14. OMC REVIEW

a) Was there evidence that this competition prompted a request for review by the Merit Commissioner?  Yes  No  NA

If yes, -- # requests received by the Office of the Merit Commissioner?

-- Did the Merit Commissioner support the ministry's appointment decision?  Yes  No

What evidence supports this finding?

- Reviewed / no changes
- Override to fields and/or comments
- Change to Auditor's finding (e.g., MNA (Process) to MNA (Doc), Merit to MNA)

Reviewed by:

Date: